



Massachusetts

Department of Correction

Quarterly Report on the Status of Prison Overcrowding, Second Quarter of 2000

**Submitted in Compliance with Chapter 799
Section 21 of the Acts of 1985**

Argeo Paul Cellucci
Governor

Jane Swift
Lieutenant Governor

Jane Perlov
Secretary of Public Safety

Michael T. Maloney
Commissioner

Kathleen M. Dennehy
Deputy Commissioner

August, 2000

Approved by: State Purchasing Agent
Publication No: 14,602-09-45-10-10-86

2000 Second Quarter Report

Section Twenty-one of Chapter 799 of the Acts of 1985 directs the Commissioner of Correction to report quarterly on the status of overcrowding in state and county facilities. This statute calls for the following information:

Such report shall include, by facility, the average daily census for the period of the report and the actual census on the first and the last days of the report period. Said report shall also contain such information for the previous twelve months and a comparison to the rated capacity of such facility.

This report presents the required statistics for the second quarter of 2000.

This report was prepared by Pamela McLaughlin of the Research and Planning Division, and is based on daily count sheets prepared by the Classification Division.

2000 Second Quarter Report

Contents

Table of Contents	1
Technical Notes	2
Abbreviations	3
Table 1. Population in Department of Correction Facilities, April 3, 2000 to June 30, 2000	4
Table 2. Population in Department of Correction Facilities, April 1, 1999 to March 31, 2000	5
Table 3. Population in County Correctional Facilities by County, April 3, 2000 to June 30, 2000	6
Table 4. Population in County Correctional Facilities by Facility, April 3, 2000 to June 30, 2000	6
Table 5. Population in County Correctional Facilities by County, April 1, 1999 to March 31, 2000	7
Table 6. Population in County Correctional Facilities by Facility, April 1, 1999 to March 31, 2000	7
Figure 1. DOC Sentenced Population, Second Quarters of 1999 and 2000	8
Figure 2. HOC Population, Second Quarters of 1999 and 2000	8
Table 7. Quarterly DOC Court Commitments by Sex, 1999 and 2000	9
Figure 3. Quarterly DOC Court Commitments by Sex, 1999 and 2000	9

Technical Notes, 1996 to Present¹

- The official capacity or custody level designation for each facility can change for a number of reasons, e.g. expansion of facility beds, decrease of facility beds due to fire, or changes in contracts with vendors. In all tables the capacity and custody level reflects the status at the end of the reporting period. The design capacity is reported for correctional facilities in Tables 1 through 6.
- On November 15, 1996, one hundred new modular beds were added to MCI Concord, increasing its design capacity to 614. Ninety-six modular beds were also added to MCI Norfolk, increasing its total to 1,084 beds. Pondville Correctional Center was reclassified from Custody Level 3/2 to Custody Level 3.
- Two hundred and forty-three new modular beds were added to Middlesex (Billerica) House of Correction on November 15, 1996, increasing its total to 874 beds, and the Middlesex county total to 1,035 beds.
- Due to changes in the Massachusetts General Law, DOC consolidated one unit at the Bridgewater Treatment Center and back-filled with general population inmates. These design capacity beds were placed on-line November 8, 1996 and first appeared on the November 12, 1996 daily count sheet. Three hundred additional beds were placed on-line during the third quarter of 1997.
- Due to a DOC policy modification, the security level of MCI-Shirley (Min) was changed from Security Level 3/2 to Security Level 3 during the first quarter of 1996 .
- Where relevant, the population figures for all facilities include both male and female inmates except as shown at Lancaster.
- State inmates housed in the Hampshire County contract program are included in the county population tables, as are all other state inmates housed in county facilities.
- Longwood Treatment Center is a specialized DOC facility which houses primarily individuals incarcerated for operating under the influence of alcohol. Because the inmates are predominantly county sentenced inmates, the inmate count and bed capacity are also included in Tables 3 and 4.
- Beginning with the second quarter of 1998 quarterly report, the following county correctional facilities are presented individually: Bristol Dartmouth, Bristol Ash Street, David R. Nelson Correctional Addiction Center, and Bristol Pre-Release in Bristol County; Essex Middleton and Essex Lawrence Correctional Alternative Center in Essex County; Middlesex Cambridge and Middlesex Billerica in Middlesex County; Norfolk Braintree, Norfolk Dedham, and Norfolk Contract in Norfolk County. Beginning with the third quarter of 1998 report, facilities for Suffolk and Hampden counties are presented individually.
- Nashua Street inmates housed at other facilities are reported in the counts for the facilities in which they are in custody.
- On October 22, 1997, Eastern Massachusetts Correctional Alcohol Center (EMCAC) was renamed the David R. Nelson Correctional Addiction Center (DRNCAC).
- Due to a DOC policy modification, the security level of Hodder House was changed from Security Level 2 to Security Level 3/2 during the first quarter of 2000 .
- On May 18, 2000, the Braintree Alternative Center was temporarily closed for renovations by the Norfolk County Sheriff's Office. All inmates were transferred to the minimum security Pre-Release Center in Dedham.

¹ For technical notes prior to 1996, please refer to previous quarterly reports.

- On April 18, 1995, new security level designations were established according to 103 DOC 101 Correctional Institutions/Custody Levels policy which states

Custody Levels:

- **Level One.** The least restrictive in the department and is reserved only for those inmates who are at the end of their sentence and have been identified as posing little to no threat to the community. Supervision is minimal and indirect.

- **Level Two.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate maximum responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions prior to their release. Direct supervision of these inmates is not required, but intermittent observation may be appropriate under certain conditions. Inmates within this level may be permitted to access the community unescorted to participate in programming to include, but not limited to, work release, educational release, etc.

- **Level Three.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of returning to the inmate a greater sense of personal responsibility and autonomy while still providing for supervision and monitoring of behavior and activity. Inmates within this security level are not considered a serious risk to the safety of staff, inmates or to the public. Program participation is mandated and geared toward their potential reintegration into the community. Access to the community is limited and under constant direct staff supervision.

- **Level Four.** A custody level in which both the design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the goal of restoring to the inmate some degree of responsibility and control of their own behavior and actions, while still insuring the safety of staff and inmates. Design/construction is generally characterized by high security parameters and limited use of internal physical barriers. Inmates at this level have demonstrated the ability to abide by rules and regulations and require intermittent supervision. However, behavior in the community, i.e., criminal sentence and/or the presence of serious outstanding legal matters indicate the need for some control and for segregation from the community. Job and program opportunities exist for all inmates within the perimeter of the facility.

- **Level Five.** A custody level in which design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates. Inmates accorded to this status may present an escape risk or pose a threat to other inmates, staff, or the orderly running of the institution, however, at a lesser degree than those at level 6. Supervision remains constant and direct. Through an inmates willingness to comply with institutional rules and regulations, increased job and program opportunities exist.

- **Level Six.** A custody level in which both design/construction as well as inmate classification reflect the need to provide maximum external and internal control and supervision of inmates primarily through the use of high security parameters and extensive use of internal physical barriers and check points. Inmates accorded this status present serious escape risks or pose serious threats to themselves, to other inmates, to staff, or the orderly running of the institution. Supervision of inmates is direct and constant. Inmates are confined to their cells at all times, except when they are removed for authorized activities. Inmates within their status, when removed from their cell, are typically under escort and in restraints.

Abbreviations

AC	- Addiction Center	OSCC	- Old Colony Correctional Center
ADP	- Average Daily Population	OUI	- Operating Under the Influence
ATU	- Awaiting Trial Unit	PPREP	- Pre-Parole Residential Environmental Phase Program
CRS	- Contract Residential Services Includes Charlotte House, and Houston House	PRC	- Pre-Release Center
DDU	- Departmental Disciplinary Unit	SBCC	- Souza-Baranowski Correctional Center
DOC	- Department of Correction	SECC	- Southeastern Correctional Center
DRNCAC	David R. Nelson Correctional Addiction Center	SDPTC	- Sexually Dangerous Person Treatment Center
DSU	- Departmental Segregation Unit	SMCC	- South Middlesex Correctional Center (formerly SMPRC)
HOC	- House of Correction	SH	- State Hospital
LCAC	- Lawrence Correctional Alternative Center	TC	- Treatment Center (Longwood)
NECC	- Northeastern Correctional Center		
NCCI	- North Central Correctional Institution at Gardner		

Table 1 provides the DOC figures for the second quarter of 2000. As this table indicates, the DOC population (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, and county inmates at the Mass. Boot Camp) increased by 41 inmates from the first day of the second quarter to the last day of the quarter. At the end of the quarter, the DOC operated with 9,769 inmates in the system, and the average daily population was 9,706 with a design capacity of 8,130. Thus, the DOC operated at 119 percent of design capacity.

Population in DOC Facilities, April 3, 2000 to June 30, 2000

Custody Level/ Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	668	622	697	633	106%
SBCC	1,016	999	1,001	1,024	99%
Framingham-ATU	126	128	118	64	197%
Custody Level 5					
OCCC	718	711	711	488	147%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	840	902	901	614	137%
Framingham	485	484	501	388	125%
Norfolk	1,498	1,497	1,496	1,084	138%
NCCI	958	958	953	568	169%
SECC	309	303	322	456	68%
Bay State	292	291	293	266	110%
Mass. Boot Camp	86	95	89	128	67%
Shirley-Medium	1,086	1,095	1,091	720	151%
*Bridgewater SDPTC	340	334	349	345	99%
Sub-Total	8,422	8,419	8,522	6,778	124%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	129	126	135	151	85%
NECC	160	159	154	150	107%
SECC-Minimum	98	97	100	100	98%
Shirley-Minimum	258	247	265	403	64%
Pondville	148	151	145	100	148%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	101	113	83	94	107%
Lancaster-Female	56	59	56	59	95%
SMCC	172	186	162	125	138%
Hodder House	14	17	11	35	40%
Sub-Total	1,136	1,155	1,111	1,217	93%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	77	80	71	55	140%
Park Drive	41	42	42	50	82%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	12	14	10	15	80%
Houston House	9	9	7	15	60%
PPREP	9	9	6	n.a.	n.a.
Sub-Total	148	154	136	135	110%
Total	9,706	9,728	9,769	8,130	119%
Bridgewater SH	348	361	347	227	153%
Bridgewater SDPTC	198	192	207	216	92%
Bridgewater AC	88	105	93	214	41%
Longwood TC	111	115	110	125	89%
Sub-Total	745	773	757	782	95%
Grand Total	10,451	10,501	10,526	8,912	117%
Houses of Correction	606	620	598	n.a.	n.a.
Federal Prisons	18	20	18	n.a.	n.a.
Inter-State Contract	203	243	95	n.a.	n.a.

(* See Technical Notes)

Table 2 provides the DOC figures for the previous twelve months - i.e., for the period April 1, 1999 to March 31, 2000. These figures indicate that the DOC population decreased by 515 (-5%) over this twelve month period (excluding Bridgewater SH, SDPTC, AC, Longwood TC, and county inmates at the Mass. Boot Camp), from 10,265 in April, 1999 to 9,750 in March, 2000.

Population in DOC Facilities, April 1, 1999 to March 31, 2000

Custody Level/ Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Populatio n	Ending Populatio n	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Custody Level 6					
Cedar Junction	573	565	621	633	91%
SBCC	873	751	1,002	1,024	85%
Framingham-ATU	139	135	136	64	217%
Custody Level 5					
OCCC	721	735	712	488	148%
Custody Level 4					
Concord	1,125	1,349	909	614	183%
Framingham	490	508	488	388	126%
Norfolk	1,489	1,492	1,496	1,084	137%
NCCI	960	966	959	568	169%
SECC	306	305	304	456	67%
Bay State	294	295	290	266	111%
Mass. Boot Camp	119	109	93	128	93%
Shirley-Medium	1,092	1,095	1,091	720	152%
*Bridgewater SDPTC	348	350	338	345	101%
Sub-Total	8,529	8,655	8,439	6,778	126%
Custody Level 3					
Plymouth	154	186	126	151	102%
NECC	198	246	159	150	132%
SECC-Minimum	96	97	98	100	96%
Shirley-Minimum	288	315	250	403	71%
Pondville	173	184	151	100	173%
Custody Level 3/2					
Lancaster-Male	120	124	113	94	128%
Lancaster-Female	56	60	57	59	95%
SMCC	190	189	185	125	152%
Hodder House	27	21	18	35	77%
Sub-Total	1,302	1,422	1,157	1,217	107%
Custody Level 2					
Boston State	89	97	80	55	162%
Park Drive	49	50	42	50	98%
Custody Level 1					
Charlotte	12	14	14	15	80%
Houston House	11	9	9	15	73%
PPREP	10	18	9	n.a.	n.a.
Sub-Total	171	188	154	135	127%
Total	10,002	10,265	9,750	8,130	123%
Bridgewater SH	348	351	354	227	153%
Bridgewater SDPTC	179	176	191	216	83%
Bridgewater AC	92	108	107	214	43%
Longwood TC	134	132	116	125	107%
Sub-Total	753	767	768	782	96%
Grand Total	10,755	11,032	10,518	8,912	121%
Houses of Correction	592	592	608	n.a.	n.a.
Federal Prisons	23	23	20	n.a.	n.a.
Inter-State Contract	248	248	243	n.a.	n.a.

(* See Technical Notes)

Table 3 presents the county figures for the second quarter of 2000. The county population decreased by 389 inmates, (-3%), from the first day of the second quarter to the last day of the quarter. At the end of the quarter, the county system operated with 11,450 inmates, with an average daily population of 11,666 in facilities with a total design capacity of 8,356. Thus, the county system operated at 140 percent of design capacity.

Population in County Correctional Facilities by County, April 3, 2000 to June 30, 2000					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	244	258	228	110	222%
Berkshire	197	199	200	116	170%
Bristol	1,081	1,070	1,095	666	162%
Dukes	34	33	28	19	179%
Essex	1,302	1,359	1,263	635	205%
Franklin	148	141	157	63	235%
Hampden	1,700	1,778	1,680	1,303	130%
Hampshire	236	246	228	248	95%
Middlesex	1,145	1,190	1,113	1,035	111%
Norfolk	573	575	566	379	151%
Plymouth	1,390	1,378	1,362	1,140	122%
Suffolk	2,254	2,244	2,203	1,599	141%
Worcester	1,206	1,204	1,186	790	153%
Longwood TC	111	115	110	125	89%
Mass. Boot Camp	45	49	31	128	35%
Total	11,666	11,839	11,450	8,356	140%

Table 4 presents the county figures for the second quarter of 2000. The following table presents a breakdown of multi-facility counties, by facility.

Population in County Correctional Facilities by Facility, April 3, 2000 to June 30, 2000					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Bristol County					
Bristol Ash Street	155	151	157	206	75%
Bristol Dartmouth	764	766	773	304	251%
Bristol DRNCAC	79	79	82	100	79%
Bristol Pre-Release	83	74	83	56	148%
Essex County					
Essex Middleton	1,049	1,077	1,020	500	210%
Essex LCAC	253	282	243	135	187%
Hampden County					
Hampden	1,527	1,603	1,505	1,178	130%
Hampden-OUI	173	175	175	125	138%
Middlesex County					
Middlesex Cambridge	214	226	190	161	133%
Middlesex Billerica	931	964	923	874	107%
Norfolk County					
Norfolk Dedham	519	499	515	302	172%
Norfolk Braintree	10	24	0	52	19%
Norfolk Contract	44	52	51	25	176%
Suffolk County					
Suffolk Nashua Street	626	610	616	453	138%
Suffolk South Bay	1,628	1,634	1,587	1,146	142%


Table 5 presents the county figures for the previous twelve months. These figures indicate that the county population decreased by 451 inmates, or minus 4 percent, over this twelve-month period, from 12,291 in April, 1999, to 11,840 in March, 2000.

Population in County Correctional Facilities by County, April 1, 1999 to March 31, 2000					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Barnstable	254	263	263	110	231%
Berkshire	205	227	194	116	177%
Bristol	1,065	1,071	1,093	666	160%
Dukes	30	37	33	19	158%
Essex	1,291	1,282	1,333	635	203%
Franklin	141	149	140	63	224%
Hampden	1,753	1,707	1,773	1,303	135%
Hampshire	234	211	249	248	94%
Middlesex	1,261	1,378	1,191	1,035	122%
Norfolk	576	624	564	379	152%
Plymouth	1,317	1,354	1,354	1,140	116%
Suffolk	2,354	2,554	2,258	1,599	147%
Worcester	1,268	1,259	1,228	790	161%
Longwood TC	134	132	116	125	107%
Mass. Boot Camp	60	43	51	128	47%
Total	11,943	12,291	11,840	8,356	143%

Table 6 presents the county figures for the previous twelve months. The following table presents a breakdown of multi-facility counties, by facility.


Population in County Correctional Facilities by Facility, April 1, 1999 to March 31, 1999					
Facility	Avg Daily Population	Beginning Population	Ending Population	Design Capacity	% ADP Capacity
Bristol County					
Bristol Ash Street	153	134	157	206	74%
Bristol Dartmouth	759	768	779	304	250%
Bristol DRNCAC	80	97	82	100	80%
Bristol Pre-Release	73	72	75	56	130%
Essex County					
Essex Middleton	1,031	1,074	1,064	500	206%
Essex LCAC	260	208	269	135	193%
Hampden County					
Hampden	1,602	1,569	1,596	1,178	136%
Hampden-OUI	151	138	177	125	121%
Middlesex County					
Middlesex Cambridge	249	256	214	161	155%
Middlesex Billerica	1,012	1,122	977	874	116%
Norfolk County					
Norfolk Dedham	498	515	494	302	165%
Norfolk Braintree	27	32	24	52	52%
Norfolk Contract	51	77	46	25	204%
Suffolk County					
Suffolk Nashua Street	621	636	627	453	137%
Suffolk South Bay	1,733	1,918	1,631	1,146	151%

Figure 1.
DOC Sentenced Population, Second Quarters of 1999 and 2000



The graph above compares the DOC sentenced population for the second quarter in 1999 to that in 2000, by month. For April, 2000 the DOC population decreased by 573 inmates (-6%) compared with the same month of 1999; for May, the population decreased by 578 inmates (-6%); and for June the population decreased by 366 inmates, or minus 4 percent.

Figure 2.
HOC Population, Second Quarters of 1999 and 2000




The graph above compares the HOC population for the second quarter in 1999 to that in 2000, by month. For April, 2000 the HOC population decreased by 370 inmates (-3%) compared with the same month of 1999; for May, the population decreased by 439 inmates (-4%); and for June, the population decreased by 643 inmates, or (-5%) percent.

Note: Data for Figures 1 and 2 were taken from the end of the month daily count sheet compiled by the Classification Division.

Table 7 provides quarterly statistics on new, criminally sentenced court commitments to the DOC for the second quarters of 1999 and 2000, by sex. Overall, there was a decrease of 48 new court commitments, or minus 7 percent for 2000 in comparison with the number of new court commitments in 1999, from 642 to 594. Male commitments for 2000 decreased by 46, or minus 11 percent from 1999. Female commitments for 2000 decreased by 2, or minus 1 percent compared to the number of commitments for 1999.

Quarterly DOC New Court Commitment by Sex			
	1999	2000	Difference
Males			
First Quarter	478	415	-13%
Second Quarter	417	371	-11%
Sub -Total	895	786	-12%
Females			
First Quarter	242	272	12%
Second Quarter	225	223	-1%
Sub -Total	467	495	6%
Total	1,362	1,281	-6%

Figure 3 provides a graphical representation of the number of new, criminally sentenced court commitments to the DOC during the second quarters of 1999 and 2000, by sex.



Note: Data for Table 7 and Figure 3 were obtained from the DOC's Inmate Tracking database.